

not necessary for me to give my ruling on the question as to whether the House is competent to consider such a Bill. As I have already stated that the Bill requires recommendation, I need not say anything about the competence of this House to consider this Bill.

RULING ON A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE AGAINST THE CHIEF MINISTER ON A PHAMPLET "MYSORE AFTER INTEGRATION".

Mr. SPEAKER:—On 21st January 1970, Sri H. N. Nanje Gowda raised a question of privilege against the Chief Minister. Sri Nanje-Gowda alleged that the document "Mysore after integration—Survey of Development of different Regions" laid by the Chief Minister on the Table of the House on 9th September 1969 contained misleading figures. He further contended that the Chief Minister chose the last day of a Session for laying on the Table of the House the particular document. Secondly, the member has alleged that the statement is not correct in regard to the expenditure incurred by the Government on the integrated areas. I have considered whether these two facts would constitute prima facie case to give my consent.

I have gone through a number of rulings of the Presiding Officers when such matters of privileges were sought to be raised in Parliament and other State Legislatures.

According to "May", the House may treat the making of a deliberately misleading statement as a contempt. In 1963, the House of Commons resolved that in making a personal statement which contained words which he later admitted to be true a member had been guilty of a grave contempt. (Profuma's case).

A breach of privilege arises only when the member or the Minister makes a false Statement or an incorrect statement wilfully, deliberately and knowingly.

On 17th August 1966, in Lok Sabha when two members sought to raise a question of privilege against the Minister for Food and Agriculture on the ground that he had suppressed the truth and misled the Public Accounts Committee when he appeared before them, the Speaker of Lok Sabha observed among other things as follows:—

"Incorrect statements made by a Minister cannot be the basis for a breach of privilege. It is only a deliberate falsehood, if it can be substantiated, that would certainly bring the offence within the meaning of breach of privilege."

(MR. SPEAKER)

I may also recall to the members the ruling pointed out by the Minister for Law and Parliamentary Affairs in the House when this matter was raised by the member.

In the instant case I do not find any *prima facie* evidence to show that any incorrect statement is made by the Chief Minister either deliberately or with the intention of misleading the House.

I hold that the matter is not in order.

RULING ON A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE AGAINST THE CHIEF MINISTER ON HIS ALLEGED STATEMENTS ABOUT MYSORE-MAHARASTRA BORDER.

MR. SPEAKER:—Sri H. M. Channabasappa had given notice of a question of privilege in which he has alleged that the statement of the Chief Minister in the House, in reply to a supplementary question put by him on the main question given notice of by Sri D. M. Siddaiah, seeking to know whether the Central Government had intimated the State Government about the action proposed to be taken on the Mahajan Commission Report to solve the border dispute between the States of Mysore and Maharashtra was different from what the Chief Minister had stated while addressing a Political Conference at Belgaum recently.

I have gone through the proceedings of the House when the particular question mentioned by the member was answered in the House. Sri Channabasappa put a supplementary question, seeking to know whether the Chief Minister had stated at the Political Conference at Belgaum that the Central Government was influenced by foreign money and foreign pressures in taking decisions. The Chief Minister replied that this was not so. I have also looked into the newspaper produced by Sri Channabasappa, containing a statement reported to have been made by the Chief Minister at Belgaum. It would appear that what the Chief Minister has stated at the Conference is in a different context from what it was stated in the House. In the House, the question was regarding Belgaum and the Chief Minister stated that the Central Government was not influenced by foreign money and pressures.

In reply to the debate on the motion, moved by Sri V. N. Patil recently, the Chief Minister referred to his statement made at Belgaum incidentally and categorically denied that he had made any such statement attributed to him by Sri Channabasappa.